Categorical Exclusion Documentation Format for Actions Other Than Hazardous Fuels and Fire Rehabilitation Actions

Humane Borders Water Stations Renewal DOI-BLM-AZ-P020-2013-0022-CX

A. Background

BLM Office: Lower Sonoran Field Office (LSFO)

Lease/Serial/Case File No.: AZA-32809

Proposed Action Title/Type: **FLPMA Land Use Authorization – Permit Renewal** Location of Proposed Action: **T. 13 S., R. 6 W., Sec. 15; T. 14 S., R. 5 W., Sec. 3** Description of Proposed Action: The applicant, Humane Borders, has applied to renew its existing land use permit, which authorized three (3) water stations on BLM managed lands south of Ajo, Arizona. Each of the water stations is composed of two (2) 60 gallon blue polyethylene tanks. Each tank is marked with Humane Borders insignia, and is equipped with a spring loaded faucet to prevent accidental draining. The tank caps are manually sealed to prevent casual disturbance. The tanks are mounted on a square metal stand rated to hold 1,000 lbs. and have padded feet. The padded feet prevent the stand from shifting during heavy wind and/or rain. The water stations each consist of a 2' by 3' blue flag on a 20'-40' flagpole sleeved over rebar and driven flush with the ground. The stations are maintained and/or recharged on a daily basis. The water tanks are periodically flushed to guarantee water quality, and at each servicing interval, the chlorine content is continually monitored and adjusted as necessary. The applicant is requesting a 2-year term, with restricted use.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan (LUP) Name: Lower Sonoran Record of Decision & Approved Resource Management Plan

Date Approved/Amended: September 14, 2012

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decision(s) (objectives, terms, and conditions):

LR-1: Manage lands and realty actions to effectively support public needs and resource management objectives.

LR-1.3: (Minor Linear and Nonlinear LUAs): Authorize minor linear and nonlinear LUAs in locations that minimize resource impacts, are compatible with multiple use objectives, and do not compromise the existing rights of current holders.

C: Compliance with NEPA:

The Proposed Action is categorically excluded from further documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with 516 DM 2, Appendix 1, or 516 DM 11.5:

E.9 which states: Renewals and assignments of leases, permits, or rights-of-ways where no additional rights are conveyed beyond those granted by the original authorization.

This categorical exclusion is appropriate in this situation because there are no extraordinary circumstances potentially having effects that may significantly affect the environment. The proposed action has been reviewed, and none of the extraordinary circumstances described in 516 DM 2 or 516 DM 11.5 apply.

I considered: N/A

D: Signature

criteria and that it wou	rmined that the proposal is in accordance with the last involve any significant environmental effection further environmental review.	0	
Prepared by:	// Jo Ann Goodlow	Date:	6/12/2013
	Jo Ann Goodlow Project Lead		
Reviewed by:	// Leah Baker	Date:	2013-6-14
	Leah Baker Planning & Environmental Coordinate		
Reviewed by:	// Edward J. Kender	Date:	6/17/13
	Edward J. Kender Acting Field Manager		

Contact Person

For additional information concerning this CX review, contact:

Jo Ann Goodlow, Realty Specialist, Phoenix District Office - Lower Sonoran Field Office, 21605 North 7th Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona 85027, 623-580-5500.

BLM Categorical Exclusions: Extraordinary Circumstances¹ Attachment 1

The act	The action has been reviewed to determine if any of the extraordinary				
		3 CFR 46.215) apply. The project would:			
1. Have significant impacts on public health or safety?					
Yes	No	Rationale: The proposed action will not present significant impacts			
		on public health or safety. The placement of the water stations aid in			
		the prevention of deaths from exposure/dehydration.			
2. I	Have sign	nificant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic			
C	character	istics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge			
1	ands; wi	lderness or wilderness study areas; wild or scenic rivers; national			
r	natural la	andmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime			
f	armland	s; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order			
1	1988); n	ational monuments; migratory birds (Executive Order 13186); and			
(ther eco	logically significant or critical areas?			
Yes	No	Rationale: The proposed action will not present any significant			
		impacts on natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as			
		historic or cultural resources. It is unlikely that cultural resources			
		exist in and around the proposed areas. There will also be no			
		significant impacts to park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness or			
		wilderness study areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural			
		landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands;			
		wetlands; floodplains; national monuments; migratory birds or other			
		ecologically significant or critical areas.			
		hly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved			
		concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section			
	02(2)(E)				
Yes	No	Rationale: The proposed renewal would not have any highly			
		controversial environmental effects, nor would it involve unresolved			
		conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources.			
		hly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or			
		nique or unknown environmental risks?			
Yes	No	Rationale: The nature of the proposed renewal does not present with			
		any potentially significant environmental effects, nor does it involve			
<u> </u>		unique or unknown environmental risks.			
5. Establish a precedent for future action, or represent a decision in principle					
about future actions, with potentially significant environmental effects?					
Yes	No	Rationale: Placement of the water stations does not establish a			
		precedent for future action, nor does it represent a decision in principle			
		about future actions, with potentially significant environmental			
	<u> </u>	effects.			
6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but					
cumulatively significant, environmental effects?					

¹ If an action has any of these impacts, you must conduct NEPA analysis.

Yes	No	Rationale: The proposed action will not have a direct relationship to		
		other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively		
		significant, environmental effects.		
		ificant impacts on properties listed or eligible for listing, on the		
		Register of Historic Places as determined by either the Bureau or		
	office?			
Yes	No	Rationale: The proposed action does not have any significant impacts		
		on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.		
Q I		ificant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the		
		adangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on		
		d Critical Habitat for these species?		
Yes	No	Rationale: Issuing the renewal will not have significant impacts on		
		species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or		
		Threatened Species, nor will it have significant impacts on designated		
		Critical Habitat for these species.		
		Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed		
		otection of the environment?		
Yes	No	Rationale: The proposed renewal does not violate a Federal law or a		
1		State, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of		
		the environment.		
		sproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority ns (Executive Order 12898)?		
Yes	No	Rationale: The proposed renewal will not have a disproportionately		
1 65	110	high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations.		
		ingit and adverse effect on low income of inmority populations.		
11. I	Limit acc	ess to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by		
		ligious practitioners, or significantly adversely affect the physical		
		of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007)?		
Yes	No	Rationale: The proposed renewal will not limit access to and		
1_	_	ceremonial use of Indian scared sites on Federal lands by Indian		
		religious practitioners, or significantly adversely affect the physical		
		integrity of such sacred sites.		
12. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious				
weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area, or actions				
that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such				
	T	ederal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112)?		
Yes	No	Rationale: The proposed renewal should not contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-		
		native invasive species known to occur within the area.		
		native invasive species known to occur within the area.		

Decision

Attachment 2

Project Description:

The applicant, Humane Borders, has applied to renew its existing land use permit, which authorized three (3) water stations on BLM managed lands south of Ajo, Arizona. Each of the water stations is composed of two (2) 60 gallon blue polyethylene tanks. Each tank is marked with Humane Borders insignia, and is equipped with a spring loaded faucet to prevent accidental draining. The tank caps are manually sealed to prevent casual disturbance. The tanks are mounted on a square metal stand rated to hold 1,000 lbs. and have padded feet. The padded feet prevent the stand from shifting during heavy wind and/or rain. The water stations each consist of a 2' by 3' blue flag on a 20'-40' flagpole sleeved over rebar and driven flush with the ground. The stations are maintained and/or recharged on a daily basis. The water tanks are periodically flushed to guarantee water quality, and at each servicing interval, the chlorine content is continually monitored and adjusted as necessary. The applicant is requesting a 2-year term, with restricted use.

Decision: Based on a review of the project described above and field office staff recommendations, I have determined that the project is in conformance with the land use plan and is categorically excluded from further environmental analysis. It is my decision to approve the action as proposed, with the following stipulations (if applicable).

Approved By:	// Edward J. Kender	 Date:	6/17/13	
	Edward J. Kender			

MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER REMARKS